DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 183 HE 013 676

AUTHOR	Lienemann, William H.; Bullis, Bruce
TITLE	Collective Bargaining in Higher Education Systems: A Study of Four States.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.; Northeastern Illinois Univ., Chicago.
REPORT NO	AASCU-80-4
PUB DATE	Oct 80
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1 Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036.
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Administrators; *Collective Bargaining; College Administration; *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Decision Making; *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Workload; *Governance; Higher Education; Policy Formation; *Power Structure; School Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Employment Benefits; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS	Florida; Illinois; Minnesota; New York

ABSTRACT

Systemwide bargaining in higher education in four states (Florida, Minnesota, New York, Illinois) was studied to determine whether institutions were affected in the manner predicted by previous literature, whether the amounts of influence, or power, of various institutional decision-makers were affected, and whether the viewpoints of respondents varied according to eight variables. These variables were rank, union/nonunion affiliation, state, sex, years employed, highest collegiate degree, age, and employee category. A total of 287 individuals on 12 campuses were surveyed, representing the faculty, department heads, deans, vice presidents, presidents of the faculty senate, and presidents of the local union chapters. Overall, the results indicated agreement with the seven consensus predictions synthesized from research and literature on collective bargaining in higher education. One of the predictions received clear support: collective bargaining resulted in increasingly formalized relationships between faculty and administrators. Open-ended questions in the interview instrument concerned workload, support, and benefits. Generally, changes resulting from collective bargaining were perceived to be minimal. For seven levels of decision-makers, department faculty and faculty governance were judged to have experienced the greatest losses in influence, and the bargaining agent was judged to have gained the most influence. Of the seven types of decisions considered, the greatest change in authority patterns occurred in the area of faculty salary increase decisions. A sample interview instrument and a bibliography are appended. (SW)

ED200183

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS: A STUDY OF FOUR STATES

by

William H. Lienemann
Bruce Bullis

AASCU Studies—1980—No. 4

Published by the American Association
of State Colleges and Universities

Allan W. Ostar, President
Sandra K. Ralston, Editor

In Cooperation with
Northeastern Illinois University
Ronald Williams, President

Library of Congress No. 80-69555

October 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Copyright, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 013 676

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication i

Acknowledgments ii

Chapter		Page
1	Introduction	1
2	Purpose and Research Methodology	3
	Focus	3
	Interview Instrument	3
	The Sample	5
	Strategy for Analyzing Responses	6
3	Sample Description	7
4	Results	9
	Predictions from Research and Literature	9
	Summary–Predictions from Research and Literature	10
	Open Questions	11
	Summary–Open Questions	13
	Power Shift Matrix	14
	Summary–Power Shift Matrix	19
5	Conclusion	21
	Future Implications	23

Appendixes

A	Interview Instrument	27
B	Methods to be Used in Selecting Persons to be Interviewed	34
C	Comparison of Institutions in Terms of Selected Characteristics	36
D	Comparison of Systems	38
E	Table III	39
F	Table IV	41
G	Table V	44

Selected Bibliography 47

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Distribution of Sample by Selected Characteristics	7
II	Power Shifts by Decision Making Level and Decision Making Area—Comparison of Mean Scores	15
III	Predictions from the Literature Comparison of Subgroup Means and Significance Levels	39
IV	Other Potential Bargaining Outcomes Comparison of Subgroup Means and Significance Levels	41
V	Aggregate Power Shift for Decision Making Levels Comparison of Subgroup Means and Significance Levels	44

DEDICATION

In Memory of Susan Jane Bullis

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the many people who have cooperated to accomplish this research: President Ronald Williams of Northeastern Illinois University provided the necessary encouragement and resources to undertake the project; the contact people in the four state systems and on the campuses; and the selected individuals who took part in the interviews. Also included in this acknowledgment are: the interviewers–Joe Braun, Sandi Faloona, Aline Lavin, Ann Lienemann, and Joyce Rigdon, Institution Studies Office–Chain-Kuo Liu, John Braxton, and the staff; and the typist–Belle Jacobson.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

During the 1970's faculty collective bargaining became one of the most significant national developments in higher education. Over one-third of all faculty members were unionized. Since most faculty unions were formed at public institutions in the twenty-four states with collective bargaining laws, experts attributed this to the growth of state enabling legislation.

Although the rate of growth and support for unionization appeared to plateau, collective bargaining in higher education continued to be a major topic of discussion. The early writings typified descriptive essays of authors' attitudes or experiences with faculty bargaining at a particular institution or system.

As collective bargaining in public institutions and state systems increased, literature shifted in focus to the promises and problems of systemwide bargaining. This slight shift in writing, however, soon returned to descriptive experiences, positive and negative predictions, and system or statewide bargaining recommendations.

Many of these initial studies were based on responses from administrative or union leadership. Consequently, a management bias may have occurred in previously predicted outcomes of collective bargaining. This potential bias was strengthened by the increasing of state and federal intervention in higher education, shrinking enrollments, and budgets, and a tightening of the academic job market. For administrators collective bargaining appeared to be one more complicating dimension of an already complex higher education setting.

A synthesis of research findings and other writings generated the following results or predictions:

- Relationships between faculty and administrators became more formal, less collegial, and more adversarial.

  Contracts generated more rules and regulations that were written and enforced. Informal discussions and personal influence were replaced by codified procedures in decision making.

- Improved communication concerning campus issues and increased open discussions of campus problems resulted.

  Shared information and improved decisions increased credibility. However, one study indicated truncated communications because of collective bargaining.

- Traditional faculty governance would gradually disappear as unions gained strength and increased their scope.

  In a few cases, traditional governance bodies were abolished. However most faculty senates withstood the challenge through competition, cooperation, and cooptation. Some senates emerged as stronger forces; they focused on curricular and program matters as unions addressed economic matters and working conditions.

- The resulting economic impact had its effect on working conditions. Only a few studies researched the subject with mixed results.

  Differences in methodology, rather than economic facts, may have contributed to these findings. The impact of collective bargaining on salaries resulted in initial gains that began to diminish in the 1975-76 academic year.

- Power shifts in the decision making process on campus gradually shifted from the departments to the central administration.

  Middle management, department chairpersons and deans, felt the greatest loss.

- Collective bargaining enabled external agencies to influence a greater number of university decisions.

  The courts, state labor boards, state government, and national offices of the bargaining agent were more often involved in decisions.

- In system bargaining, the shift in decision making authority passes from the campus to centralized authorities. The two biggest benefactors usually were the systemwide governing board and the system bargaining agent. The union adapted its size and power to the size and power of the force it wants to change, therefore creating a "parallel power paramid" as identified by Kemerer and Baldridge. In a systemwide bargaining environment, the president, in a similar position to a middlemanager, lost power to both pyramids. Ironically system bargaining resulted in a further loss of autonomy which was the initial cause of unionization.

Chapter 2

PURPOSE AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

With the majority of faculty unions in the public sector, "students" of higher education collective bargaining are focusing on systemwide bargaining. Typically, an employing institution is one member of a system. Systemwide bargaining, as opposed to single institution bargaining, affects the greatest number of unionized faculty and institutions, provides the greatest possibility for extending unionization, and poses the greatest potential for changing influence relationships, particularly with reference to institutional autonomy.

Focus

Systemwide bargaining was the focus of this study. Within this broad context, this study sought to examine three areas:

- if certain predicted (primarily found in literature) or potential outcomes of the bargaining process occurred in systemwide settings;
- if influence or power shifts resulted from the collective bargaining process;
- if respondents offered differing perceptions as to the impact of collective bargaining on institutions. Their answers were analyzed in relationship to eight group membership variables;

1) year employed
2) highest academic degree held
3) category of employment (faculty member, chairperson, administrator)
4) age
5) sex
6) state location of institution
7) academic rank
8) union/nonunion affiliation

Interview Instrument

After examining twenty-one collective bargaining research projects, the authors decided to interview participants as the most accurate method for assessing the effects of collective bargaining. Participant perceptions were considered the most meaningful perspective for management, and union analysts. In order to distinguish collective bargaining reactions from other variables, a structured interview instrument was developed.

The interview instrument contained four major sections:

- background information on the person interviewed;
- seven consensus predictions from literature concerning probable effects;

Responses were recorded on a modified five-point likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. No change was the middle response. Interviewees were instructed to answer disagree or strongly disagree when indicating that opposite of the prediction occurred on their campus. If, in retrospect, a person could not establish a reasoned link between his response and the bargaining process, a no change answer was recorded.

- open-ended questions concerning potential outcomes;

  Predictions from the literature were few in number. In some cases, the predictions disagreed with research findings. Once again, a modified likert scale was used with answers ranging from significantly increased to significantly decreased. Reasons were sought if a respondent provided an answer other than no change or remained the same.

- power shift matrix indicating changes in decision making authority;

  A person's perception regarding the occurrence of any shifts in decision making authority were recorded among seven levels of decision makers:

  department faculty (Dept)

  chairpersons/deans (Chair/Deans)

  faculty governance groups (Fac/Gov)

  presidents/vice presidents (Pres/VP)

  system governing board (Board)

  system bargaining agent (Sys/Agent)

  state government (Govt)

  Perceived changes in influence among these levels were assessed in association with seven types of decisions:

  personnel decisions (hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure)

  salary increases

  workload

  allocation of funds

  curriculum policy

  program evaluation

  institutional goal setting

Whenever required, explanatory notes were recorded for each decision making area. If a clear relationship between the perceived changes and the collective bargaining process could not be established, a no change response was recorded.

The Sample

This study was based on interviews conducted at twelve campuses. A total sample of twenty-seven persons from each campus included fifteen faculty, five department chairpersons, three deans, two vice presidents, the president of the faculty senate and the president of the local union chapter.

The fifteen faculty members and five chairpersons on each campus were randomly selected for interview. In order to approximate the union-nonunion membership proportions on each campus, two faculty lists were used for randomization. Every attempt was made to select only persons employed at the institution prior to the first bargaining agreement.

Many of the research studies on collective bargaining in higher education used presidents, administrators, faculty senate presidents and union leaders as the sample on which findings and conclusions were drawn. This study emphasized faculty perspectives. Since faculty were the principal initiators of higher education bargaining, they constituted the greatest proportion of persons interviewed. A significant number of department chairpersons were included in the sample because of their unique and very controversial position between management and the faculty.

After reviewing various states to determine the samples, the authors decided to study four states with three campuses in each state. The twelve campuses yielded a potential interview population of 324 persons.

Florida, Minnesota, New York, and Illinois were selected for their differing lengths of time under a collective bargaining agreement and diverse geographic locations. The chancellor's or system office was contacted to select three representative institutions that approximated the size, mission, and environmental setting of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities System in Illinois. This sample included urban and small city settings.

After selection of the institutions, the chancellor's office identified a resource person on each campus. Initial contact with the resource person was made by telephone. Following a general explanation, a written statement explaining the study, the suggested method by which faculty and chairpersons should be selected, and an interview schedule were sent to the resource person. (See Appendix B) This person was responsible for carrying out the selection process and scheduling the interviews.

Unstructured interviews were conducted with the chancellor's office staff and the statewide union leadership prior to campus travel. This provided much needed history and current information from the two differing statewide perspectives.

The campus visits in each state took place over a three- or four-day period. An interview team of three or four persons conducted the interviews. An unstructured interview was held with the president, or the president's representative, on each campus. The interviews in the four states were completed over an eight-month period with the final visit to New York being delayed for several months until a challenge election was completed.

Strategy for Analyzing Responses

The first substantive section of this study analyzed responses to seven predictive statements. Each prediction, in turn, was assessed in terms of eight group membership variables described previously. Differences in group mean responses on each prediction were evaluated by analysis of variance. A difference was judged significant if the F statistic attained the .01 alpha level. The .01 level was chosen to minimize the number of apparently significant associations which result from sampling error.

The next section of this study assessed differential group responses to ten open questions.

One-way analysis of variance, that is, the F test at the .01 level, again was used to judge the extent of differential subgroup response to this series of statements.

The final subject investigated in this study pertained to changing influence or power relationships which resulted from systemwide bargaining. The basis for collecting information in this section of the study was a "power shift" matrix (see Appendix A). The matrix arrayed seven different *levels* of university decision-makers along the horizontal axis, against seven *types* of decision making along the vertical. Persons interviewed were instructed to indicate which decision-making levels had gained or lost influence in respect to a given class of decisions. Respondents also could indicate no change. The design assumed a closed decision-making system and that gains and losses in influence would be in approximate balance. In this "power shift" section, data was analyzed in various combinations. These ranged from means calculated for levels of decision-makers across all types of decisions to analysis of subgroup responses to single decisions.

Chapter 3

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

Of the 324 interviews scheduled, 287 were completed. Slightly more than 11 percent of the persons selected for interviews did not appear because of schedule conflicts, illness, and weather problems. The average number of interviews in each state was seventy-two.

One hundred seventy-six bargaining unit faculty were interviewed. One hundred twenty-three identified themselves as union members, forty-eight as nonunion, and five indicated no response. Fifty-eight deans and vice presidents were interviewed in the administrative category. Fifty-three chairpersons completed the sample. Table I details the sample according to rank, sex, highest degree held, years at the institution, age, and employee category.

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Number Interviewed	Percent
Rank		
Professor	127	44.3
Assoc. Prof.	78	27.2
Asst. Prof.	45	15.7
Instructor	7	2.4
No Rank	30	10.4
Sex		
Male	236	82.2
Female	51	17.8
Highest Degree Held		
Doctorate	215	74.9
Masters	64	22.3
Bachelors	6	2.1
None	2	.7
Years at Institution		
1–6	67	23.4
7–9	69	24.0
10–12	73	25.4
13 or more	78	27.2
Age		
Less than 40	76	26.5
40–50	134	46.7
Over 50	73	25.4
No Response	4	1.4
Category		
Faculty	176	61.3
Chairperson	53	18.5
Administration	58	20.2

Since the sample consisted of individuals on campus prior to collective bargaining, differences existed between the obtained sample and actual institutional and system populations. Theoretically, sampled individuals occupied higher ranks, held tenure in greater proportion, were more frequently male, and were slightly older. This supposition was confirmed by comparing faculty members, including chairpersons, in the sample with national statistics for AAUP category IIA institutions. (IIA institutions confer degrees above the bachelors.) Nine of the twelve institutions surveyed were classified as IIA.

The institutions selected for this study were considered representative of four-year institutions. (see Appendix C and D) They varied in institutional characteristics (from small city residential universities to primarily commuter urban universities), and system characteristics (from system type to bargaining unit affiliation). Although these characteristics were not compared as variables in the study, legislative authorization produced potential variables which raised questions in this study. (These questions are addressed further in this report.)

The Public Employee Labor Relations Act[1] in Minnesota included the following clause: "The employer shall not meet and negotiate or meet and confer with any employee or group of employees who are at the time designated as a member or part of an appropriate employee unit except through the exclusive representative if one is certified for that unit." The interpretation of this clause eliminated all traditional faculty governance in the Minnesota seven-institution system. In both Minnesota and Florida, the legislature and governor had to approve the agreement prior to implementation of the economic sections. Also in Florida, an impasse in bargaining would go to legislative committees for settlement. In New York the Governor's Office of Employee Relations was both the final authority in the bargaining process and the final step in the grievance process prior to binding arbitration. In the absence of state law, regulations developed by the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities in Illinois served as law concerning faculty collective bargaining in that system.

[1]Public Employee Labor Relations Act of 1971, as amended (179.61-179.77) Bureau of Mediation Services, St. Paul, Minnesota, June, 1978.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

Predictions from Research and Literature

The first seven statements in the interview instrument (Appendix A) were consensus predictions synthesized from research and literature on collective bargaining in higher education. Examination of the data for these "hypotheses" indicated that the mean score in each case was on the agreement side of the continuum. One of the predictions received clear support—collective bargaining resulted in increasingly formalized relationships between faculty and administrators. Three other predictions, with 45 percent or more of the respondents in agreement, were also strongly supported. The least supported statement was that junior faculty members had an increased role in decision making. The number of disagreement responses was low for each prediction. A relatively large percentage (38 to 47 percent on all but one statement) perceived no change as a result of bargaining.

Personal Relationships Between Faculty and Administration More Formalized

This statement received the highest percentage of agreement (58.9 percent). Nearly one-fourth of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement while less than 3 percent disagreed. Slightly better than one-third felt there had been no change.

Further analysis indicated that Minnesota respondents held significantly different views than their counterparts in other states. Minnesota respondents expressed an extremely high percentage of agreement on this question (86.3 percent) and no disagreement. The most frequently offered explanations underlying this trend were "more rules, greater reliance on procedures and more formal discussions."

Bargaining Results In Improved Communications

A slightly higher proportion of respondents (44.6 percent) agreed with this statement than agreed there was no change (42.5 percent). Almost 13 percent of those interviewed believed that bargaining caused a decrease in available information.

Minnesota recorded the least agreement with the proposition. In fact, one-third of the Minnesota respondents believed that collective bargaining resulted in less information. Respondents frequently stated that "meet and confer" had replaced general communication to the university community.

Decisions Affecting Faculty Assignments More Openly Achieved

This statement registered the single highest proportion (18.1 percent) of outright disagreement. Only 37 percent of the persons interviewed were in agreement while 45 percent responded no change. Participants who disagreed simply observed that administration made independent decisions. Individuals who agreed that assignment decisions were more open frequently referred to the grievance procedures. In a bargaining environment, respondents noted that chairpersons must be prepared to defend decisions in terms of the contract; hence, decisions were more structured and "above-board" or open.

Once again only state was the significant variable. Minnesota cited little support; Florida gave relatively good support.

Campus Sense of Community Adversely Affected

This prediction received relatively strong support. While forty-six percent of the persons interviewed agreed with this prediction, only slightly more than seven percent disagreed. Many people commented on a growing we/they adversary relationship between faculty and administration.

Only state showed variability. Minnesota was highly supportive of the prediction (75 percent); Illinois and Florida gave relatively little support.

Traditional Governance Roles Diminished

A slightly smaller proportion of respondents (39.8 percent) agreed with the statement than indicated no change (47.2 percent). This distribution represented a very moderate expression of agreement. The most frequently noted remark from those agreeing with this statement was "the union and contract have replaced traditional governance bodies."

Again, only state proved significant when analyzing the variables. Minnesota had the greatest number of persons agreeing with the idea that bargaining resulted in a lessor role for faculty governance. Since official faculty governing bodies were eliminated under the exclusivity clause, these responses were not a surprise. Conversely, 20 percent of New York's respondents perceived an increase in the importance of faculty governance since collective bargaining.

Campus Issues Discussed More Frequently

This item was related to the second item—bargaining results in improved communications. Both represented different domains of communication. As before, only a slightly higher percentage of respondents agreed with this prediction (46.7 percent) than indicated no change (43.6 percent). Nearly 13 percent perceived a decrease in discussion of issues. This response was similar to the answer given for the second item.

Two variables differentiated responses to this prediction—category and union/nonunion affiliation. Within category, faculty members indicated the greatest increase in discussions while administrators felt there had been very little change. Among faculty, union members perceived the greatest increase while nonunion faculty indicated only moderate change as a result of bargaining.

Role of Junior Faculty Increased In Decision Making

This prediction evoked the greatest proportion of no change responses (72.5 percent). Slightly fewer (20.6 percent) agreed than disagreed (7.0 percent). Eighty-three percent of New York respondents, who had the longest collective bargaining history, perceived no change on this issue. Of the eight group membership variables studied on this question, only age was significant. Predictably, respondents fifty years or older more frequently agreed with this statement than respondents from forty to forty-nine. Respondents under forty agreed less often.

Summary—Predictions from Research and Literature

Generally, the responses obtained in this study supported the predictions. Responses in all seven statements gravitated to the agreement end of the con-

tinuum with significant numbers of respondents expressing no change answers. The length of time under a collective bargaining contract only affected Illinois. Illinois, with only one year of experience under a bargaining contract, uniformly indicated high percentages of no change responses.

Of all the group membership variables, only the state variable consistently explained differences in response. In five of the seven predictive statements, state was significant. Responses obtained in Minnesota systematically differed from those obtained in three other states. In Minnesota, bargaining was perceived to result in more formalized faculty/administrator relationships; in less available campus information; in fewer openly determined decisions affecting faculty assignments and performance; in decreased sense of campus community; and in decreased importance of faculty governance. These differences found in Minnesota were tentatively attributed to the "exclusivity" clause in the Public Employee Labor Relations Act for that state. As described in chapter three, the interpretation of this clause eliminated traditional faculty governance bodies on the campuses and substituted a formal "meet and confer" process.

The remaining group membership variables contributed little to understanding respondent answers.The category of respondent made a difference in respect to only one issue–campus wide discussions. Faculty perceived an increase; administrators noticed little or no change. Union and nonunion faculty views differed only over the frequency of campus discussion. Older and younger faculty differed solely on the issue of increasing influence among junior faculty. In respect to the other six predictive statements, administrators, chairpersons, and faculty had essentially identical views.

Information gathered in unstructured interviews with each of the state's system administrators, union leaders, and campus presidents generated similar findings. Some perceived varying degrees of change, while an equal or greater number noticed very little change.

Open Questions

The second set of ten statements, the open questions, were considered for empirical investigation. Highly specific issues were addressed in this section. For example, as a result of collective bargaining, has class size, classroom contact hours, or faculty salary levels increased, decreased, or remained the same?

For purposes of discussion the ten statements in this section were grouped into three categories:

- **Workload**

  This subsection included questions of class size, teaching contact hours, personal paperwork volume, expectation performance, and time spent in committee meetings.

- **Support**

  This subsection included questions on teaching and research, physical plant quality and cleanliness, and university's instructional programs innovation.

- **Benefits**

  This subsection included questions on faculty promotion/tenure and salary.

Workload

Examination of data for the workload category indicated that in all but one instance, responses tended toward the increase end of the continuum. Of the ten statements, three items indicated noteworthy increase responses. Two of these items were in the category of workload: volume of paperwork and time spent in committee meetings.

Paperwork. Forty-six percent of the persons interviewed felt that bargaining had increased their paperwork, while only slightly more than one percent felt it had decreased. Most frequently, respondents observed that since the adoption of collective bargaining, the basis for decisions required "almost total documentation." In this connection, many persons noted an indirect role of the grievance procedure in prompting more comprehensive documentation.

The variables category and state made a difference on the question of personal paperwork. Administrators followed by department chairpersons experienced the greatest increase in paperwork, faculty the least. Florida, closely followed by Minnesota, recorded the greatest increase in paperwork. Illinois respondents, followed by those in New York, noted the least increases in paperwork.

Committee meetings. Twenty-six percent of the respondents believed that bargaining increased the time spent in faculty committee meetings. Only eleven percent perceived a decrease. Respondents most frequently noted that "union and collective bargaining meetings have been added to traditional committees which continue to operate."

Group membership variables showed no differences. All groups perceived an increase of moderate magnitude.

Teaching contact hours. This item, along with class size and performance expectations, was characterized by a high proportion of no change responses. However, group membership variables made a significant difference. Analysis of variance showed that highest degree held, sex, length of time at the institution, and state were important variables. Persons holding the masters degree perceived a slight decrease in contact hours while those with the doctorate degree perceived an increase. Females perceived a decrease in contact hours while males virtually indicated no change. Also, individuals employed at institutions for the greatest length of time perceived an increase in contact hours while those employed from seven to nine years indicated a decrease. Minnesota respondents indicated a decrease in contact hours while their counterparts indicated virtually no change. "Stricter adherance to load policies" was often cited as the reason for increased contact hours. Conversely, "(contractually based) credit hour limits preventing overloads" was most often given for decreased responses.

Class size. An overriding majority indicated no change.

Performance expectation. Slightly more respondents noted an increase as opposed to a decrease on this issue. However, a large majority indicated no change.

Support

Support consists of three items:

- support of teaching and research
- physical plant quality and cleanliness
- instructional programs, innovation and experimentation

These items were noteworthy in only two respects. First, uniformly high percentages, of no change responses were registered for each item. (84 to 96 percent) Second, respondent answers across categories were identical in all but one instance. Females perceived an increase in experimentation in instructional programs while males thought otherwise.

Benefits

Benefits consisted of two items:

- faculty opportunity for promotion and tenure
- faculty salary levels

Faculty opportunity for promotion and tenure. Respondents were divided on this question. A slightly larger proportion of persons thought such opportunities had decreased (17 percent) rather than increased (15 percent). Sixty-eight percent of the respondents indicated no change. Analysis of variance showed that no group membership variable was important.

Respondents agreed that opportunities for promotion and tenure had declined in recent years; however, most had difficulty in establishing a connection between this development and collective bargaining. Those who established a connection commented that: "more stringent standards are exercised because of collective bargaining."

Faculty Salary Levels. Responses mirrored the varied suppositions found in the literature and the mixed results of research. While 30 percent thought bargaining had improved salaries, 14 percent considered bargaining a liability. A surprisingly large number, 56 percent, believed that collective bargaining had no impact on faculty salaries.

Three variables were significant on the salary issue: category, state, and union/nonunion membership. Faculty perceived an increase in salary levels while chairpersons and administrators indicated virtually no change. Respondents from Minnesota most frequently believed that bargaining had improved salaries. This concept was least prevalent in Florida. Among faculty, union members believed that salaries improved while nonunion members thought that salaries deteriorated. Neither union nor nonunion members were able to give reasons, other than intuitive, for their perception.

Summary–Open Questions

In comparison with the first group of seven items, which were consensus predictions from the literature, the second set of ten statements elicited a far greater proportion of no change responses. This type of response was encountered over a range of from 53 percent (volume of personal paperwork) to 96 percent (quality and cleanliness of the physical plant).

Four of the five items contained in the workload category, showed minimal aggregate workload increases. In each of the three items contained in the support category, however, a slight decrease tendency was indicated by respon-

dents. More significantly a substantial majority did not detect any change in these items. The majority of respondents did not perceive any change in benefits as a result of collective bargaining.

Unlike the first set of seven statements, where state was found to be a generally successful explanatory variable, state was significant in only three of the ten items. This was not unexpected considering the minimal variability obtained in this section. Category of employee, similarly, was significant in only two instances. As in the first section, faculty, chairpersons, and administrators had relatively similar perceptions concerning the impact of collective bargaining on the majority of the items.

Information obtained in interviews with systemwide leadership, union leaders, and presidents was generally consistent with findings in this section. Union leaders were more apt to claim increases in salary and improved working conditions. Generally, all agree change was minimal because of collective bargaining.

Power Shift Matrix

As a result of the collective bargaining process, a number of writers predicted, and in some cases found, shifts in authority or power. They proposed that under systemwide collective bargaining, campuses would experience a loss in autonomy. The capacity to make decisions would gravitate toward higher reaches of the decision making hierarchy. In order to assess the visualized changes in decision making authority, this section of the study recorded various patterns, if any, that emerged. The instrument developed, the Power Shift Matrix, (Appendix A) queried respondents along seven types of decisions (personnel, salary increases, workload, fund allocation, curriculum policy, program evaluation, and goals) shared by the network decision makers characteristic of public universities operating in a bargaining environment. Each person interviewed was asked to judge whether there was a gain or loss in influence for each level of decision-maker. The seven levels of decision makers were:

- Department Faculty
- Chairperson/Dean
- Faculty Governance
- President/Vice President (Central Administration)
- Governance Board (Systems Office)
- Bargain Agent
- State Government

Once all responses were recorded, each of the seven types of decisions was analyzed for the eight group membership variables. (See Chapter 1 for variables.)

TABLE II

POWER SHIFTS BY DECISION MAKING LEVEL
AND DECISION MAKING AREA–COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES*

Decision Type	Dept/Fac	Chair	Fac/Gov	Pres/V.P.	Gov. Bd.	Agent	State/Gov
Personnel	1.95	1.96	1.86	2.04	2.00	2.43	2.01
Salary Increases	1.86	1.76	1.89	1.73	1.98	2.76	2.15
Workload	2.03	1.96	1.93	1.93	2.00	2.35	2.04
Fund Allocation	1.84	1.97	1.92	2.09	2.10	2.17	2.10
Curriculum Policy	1.80	1.93	1.96	2.03	2.07	2.09	2.02
Program Evaluation	1.90	2.09	1.91	2.15	2.17	2.10	2.03
Goals	1.81	2.03	1.89	2.15	2.19	2.13	2.07
TOTAL[1]	13.33	13.76	13.33	14.10	14.60	16.03	14.37

[1]The totals differ slightly from the sum of the parts because in the totals a missing response on any one of the parts resulted in exclusion of the case in the total.

*Item scores below 2.00 indicate a loss in influence and scores above 2.00 indicate a gain.

Department Faculty

As shown in Table II, respondents believed that department faculty experienced a moderate loss in influence across each decisions type except workload/assignment of duties. Interestingly, department faculty registered a slight gain in influence over assignments, an area of traditional faculty strength. Department faculty experienced the greatest losses in: institutional goal setting, fund allocation with the institution, and salary increase decisions.

Analysis of variance indicated significant differences in seven of fifty-six instances. Illinois, Minnesota, and Florida respondents believed department faculty lost influence in the area of salary decisions while those in New York perceived a slight gain. Of the four states, respondents from Minnesota believed that department faculty lost the most influence in program evaluation and goal setting. New York experienced the least loss in program evaluation; Florida experienced the least loss in goal setting. In goal setting, professors believed that less influence was exerted by department faculty than did associate or assistant professors. Among faculty members, nonunion staff believed department faculty now have substantially less influence over salary and workload/assignment decisions than did their union counterparts. Category (administrator, chairperson, or faculty member), age, sex, or years at the institution made no difference within the department faculty level.

Faculty Governance

Faculty governance was unique. Minor losses were recorded across all seven types of decisions, with the greatest loss falling in the area of personnel decisions (hiring, promotion, tenure, and retention of staff).

State was an important variable in three instances and rank in another. Minnesota respondents, followed by those in Illinois, thought faculty governance incurred losses in the area of fund allocation. Minnesota also registered the greatest loss for faculty governance in the program evaluation and goal setting areas. In both instances, New York was at the opposite end of the continuum indicating gains in influence in these areas. Associate professors believed that faculty governance lost power in connection with salary increase decisions. Full and assistant professors thought governance lost little in this area, although instructors thought they gained. In general, perceptions across subgroups of respondents were highly similar at the faculty governance level.

Department Chairpersons and Deans

Department chairpersons and deans considered together was the only other level which experienced an overall loss of influence. Chairpersons/deans lost authority in all but two decision making areas: program evaluation and institutional goal setting. Particular losses were noted in salary increase decisions.

State proved to be the most important variable at the chairpersons/deans level. Among the four states, Illinois respondents judged that chairpersons/deans lost the greatest amount of influence in several areas. These included personnel matters, institutional fund allocations, program evaluation, and goal setting. In Illinois, this middle management level lost the most authority over personnel decisions. Florida, as did Illinois, experienced the greatest loss in the area of personnel decisions. In New York, chairpersons/deans were thought to experience only very slight losses in influence. Minnesota was the only state that showed substantial gains in each of the four decision making areas.

Presidents/Vice Presidents

While the three on-campus levels discussed previously recorded decreases in overall influence, the presidents/vice presidents level, or central administration, gained slightly as a result of bargaining. Central administration lost authority in workload/assignment of duties and, more particularly, salary increases. Slight gains were recorded for central administration in the remaining five decision making areas: personnel decisions, institutional funds allocation, curriculum policy, program evaluation, and goal setting.

Analysis of variance revealed seven important associations at the central administration level. One association was found on age, one on highest degree, and five on the state variable. Participants under forty years old felt that central administration lost substantial amounts of influence over workload and assignment decisions. Persons over forty on the other hand, believed little was lost in this area. Individuals with the masters degree believed central administration lost authority in the area of curriculum policy; individuals with doctorate degrees indicated a gain. Systematic differences were found across the four states on five types of decisions. Among the four states, respondents from Florida indicated that central administration lost power in each of these decision making areas: personnel decisions, salary increases, fund allocations, and goal setting. In Florida, central administration showed a slight gain in one area—program evaluation. Profiles for Illinois and New York showed moderate losses in the area of salary and in personnel decisions. Conversely, both registered slight gains in fund allocations, program evaluation, and goal setting. Minnesota was in strong contrast to the other three states at this level. In each decision making area Minnesota registered increases in power from slight (salary increase decisions) to fairly substantial (personnel decisions).

This varying pattern of change by state was similar to changes noted at the chairpersons/deans level. While chairpersons/deans lost the most authority in Illinois as a result of bargaining, central administration fared least well in Florida. At both levels, Minnesota alone tended toward moderate to substantial gains in influence.

Governing Board

Of the three off-campus decision making levels, the governing board and staff, or system office, recorded the second greatest gain in overall influence. (Bargaining agents recorded the greatest gains). The system office gained power in four decision making areas and recorded essentially no change in three others. No change was registered in: workload/assignment of duties, personnel decisions and salary increases. Gains were reported in: curriculum policy, institutional fund allocations, program evaluation, and institutional goal setting. Important associations, all pertaining to the state variable, were detected at this level.

The Florida system experienced the greatest losses in influence. These losses were recorded in four of the seven decision making areas: personnel, salary increases, fund allocation, and curriculum policy. In a familiar pattern, Illinois and New York, occupying a central position in these analyses, reported slight increases in influence. An important exception occurred in the area of salary increase decisions. In both states, the system offices exerted less influence over salaries. In all decisions making areas, Minnesota respondents reported moderate gains in influence. The greatest gains were registered in institutional fund

allocation and goal setting; the least gains were recorded in curriculum policy and personnel decisions.

System Bargaining Agents

The greatest gains were recorded for the system bargaining agent. This development was expected as the bargaining agent constituted a new ingredient to decision making processes. Interest centered on the relative magnitude of bargaining agent influence over various types of decisions. Although bargaining agents exerted the greatest impact in salary increase decisions, they made their presence felt in personnel decisions (hiring, promotion, retention, and tenure decisions). Moderate gains were indicated in workload/assignment of duties. In contrast, the bargaining agent had relatively little effect in: fund allocation, goal setting, program evaluation, and curriculum policy. These findings were consistent with expectations based on a review of the literature.

The relative influence of the bargaining agent varied by state according to two types of decisions: salary increases and workload/assignment of duties. Respondents from New York were almost unanimous in their opinion that the bargaining agent gained influence over salary increase decisions. Florida respondents, though still in fundamental agreement, were least likely to note a gain. In respect to workload/assignment decisions, Minnesota respondents most often indicated a gain for the bargaining agent and those from New York least often.

Important associations were found in two other types of decisions. Individuals holding the doctorate believed the bargaining agent had little effect in the area of curriculum policy; others indicated slight gains. Females and faculty union members indicated gains in connection with program evaluation more often than males and nonunion members.

State Government

State government was the last decision making level considered in this study. Of the three off-campus levels, state government recorded the smallest gain in authority as a result of collective bargaining. Although state government registered no decreases in influence, state government gains were very slight. The largest gain pertained to salary increase decisions. Almost no change was indicated in several areas: personnel decisions, workload/assignment of duties, curriculum policy, and program evaluation.

Only five significant associations were found. Individuals under forty years old indicated slight losses of influence over personnel decisions. Participants from forty to fifty indicated no change. Respondents greater than fifty indicated a gain in this area. Nonunion faculty more often indicated a gain for government in connection with salary increase decisions than did union faculty. Persons employed at institutions twelve or less years indicated slight gains in the area of program evaluation. In contrast, persons employed for thirteen or more years indicated a decrease in influence. State was an important variable in two decision making areas: salary increases and faculty workload/assignment of duties. Among the four states, respondents from Florida most frequently indicated a gain in influence over salary increases. A slight gain was recorded in New York; no change was recorded in Minnesota. Illinois respondents indicated a slight loss in influence over salary decisions. Minnesota respondents often indicated a gain in workload/assignment decisions; New York recorded the smallest gain in workload/assignment decisions.

Summary–Power Shift Matrix

Many writers proposed that, under systemwide collective bargaining, campuses would experience a loss of autonomy. This study confirmed that theory. Three of four on-campus decision making levels lost influence. Department faculty and faculty governance experienced the greatest losses in influence. Deans and chairpersons experienced losses, though to a lesser degree. Of the on-campus decision making levels, only central administration (i.e., presidents and vice presidents) registered modest gains.

In contrast, all three levels of off-campus decision makers gained in authority. Within this set, state government registered the slightest gain followed by a more substantial gain for the system governing board and staff. As expected, the new party to decision making, the bargaining agent, scored the most substantial gains in influence.

Of the seven types of decisions considered in this study, the greatest change in authority patterns occurred in the area of faculty salary increase decisions. On-campus decision making levels experienced a loss in influence in each instance, with central administrators and chairpersons/deans experiencing the greatest losses. As expected, the bargaining agent recorded a dramatic gain in this area; state government showed a modest gain. The system office level, however, recorded a slight loss in influence.

Changes in the pattern of influence also occurred in decisions affecting faculty workload and assignments. Central administration, chairpersons/deans and faculty governance each registered slight losses in influence. Department faculty, in contrast, scored a slight gain. Of the seven types of decisions, department faculty recorded their only gain in this area of traditional faculty strength. The bargaining agent recorded a substantial gain, state government a very slight gain and the system office no change.

Some shifts in power also occurred among levels in the area of personnel decisions (hiring, retention, promotion and tenure). Here, faculty governance experienced a slight loss in influence. Department faculty and chairpersons/deans registered very slight losses. Central administration, the system office and state government recorded very slight gains. The bargaining agent recorded its second greatest gain, after salary increases, in the area of personnel decisions.

Data analyzed in terms of eight group membership variables proved significant in only one instance–state. More often than not, state accounted for variations in specific types of decisions across the seven levels. Systematic patterns of differences were also obtained according to state. While respondents, in aggregate, noted declines in influence for department faculty and faculty governance, the greatest such declines were indicated in Minnesota. In contrast with the other three states, Minnesota respondents indicated increasing authority for chairpersons/deans and central administration as a result of collective bargaining. Furthermore, other states indicated slight increases in aggregate authority for the system governing board and staff; Minnesota observed a substantial increase at this level. Scores obtained for New York and Illinois fell midway between those obtained for Minnesota and Florida. Exceptions to this statement were noted, such as the bargaining agent gaining the greatest amount of influence over salary decisions in New York, or chairpersons/deans experiencing their greatest loss of power in Illinois. In Florida, each on-campus decision making level and the system governing board and staff decreased in overall

influence. In general, and in relation to the other states, state government in Florida gained influence as a result of collective bargaining.

Apart from state, few important associations were found for the (eight) group membership variables. Highest degree and union/nonunion membership were significant in a few instances; age, years at the institution, sex, and rank, even less so. Category was not significant at all. Except for differentiation according to state, perceptions of changing authority patterns across types of decisions, and all decisions combined, were relatively homogeneous. The study determined that on-campus decisions making levels, except for central administration, lost influence as a result of collective bargaining; all off campus levels gained influence. Among the off-campus levels, the greatest gain was obtained by the bargaining agent, the least by state government. Another significant finding was that faculty, administrators, and chairpersons had similar views in every instance concerning shifting of influence.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

In this study of systemwide bargaining, interest focused on three concerns:

- Were institutions affected in the manner predicted by previous literature?
- Were the amounts of influence, or power, of various institutional decision makers affected?
- Did the viewpoints of respondents vary according to the following characteristics: rank, union/nonunion affiliation, state, sex, years employed, highest collegiate degree, age, employee category?

Through the research of these concerns the study resulted in five general conclusions:

- Commonly predicted outcomes of collective bargaining appear to be emerging.
- Collective bargaining has a minimal impact on other areas of campus life.
- Collective bargaining changed influence relationships in systemwide public university settings.
- Opinions expressed by respondents were homogenous.
- State was an important variable.

Commonly Predicted Outcomes Are Emerging

Although the emergence of outcomes was not uniform across predictions or states, a substantial number of respondents concurred that collective bargaining resulted in formalized relationships between administrators and faculty. Less give and take between these groups was evident after collective bargaining. A growing "we/they" schism was frequently alluded to during interviews. Also, respondents in substantial numbers agreed that bargaining caused a deterioration in the sense of campus community and a decline in the role played by faculty governance in decision making. These predictions found greatest support in Minnesota, least support in Florida or Illinois. (New York voiced the lowest support on the faculty governance predictions.) Two favorable consequences of bargaining concerning campus communication found support in this study. In large part, respondents agreed that bargaining resulted in better quality information on key campus issues and increased discussion. . Minnesota disputed the better quality information prediction and also had the greatest number of persons indicating a decrease in the discussion of issues.

The prediction that, under bargaining, decisions affecting faculty assignments and performance were more openly determined was controversial. While more than one-third of the persons agreed with this proposition, a large number

disagreed. The greatest disagreement occurred in Minnesota; the greatest agreement in Florida. Relatively little support was given to the concept that junior faculty play an increased role in decision making. Older respondents tended to support this idea, younger not.

Other Areas of Campus Life Were Minimally Affected

The mixed speculation and research results found in the literature were matched in this study. The predominant response was no change. Moderate increases were noted for only three items: paperwork, faculty time spent in committee meetings, and salaries The other items were essentially moot. Bargaining has had little effect in the areas of class size, contact hours, expectations that faculty perform in a creative manner, support for teaching and research, opportunity for faculty promotion and tenure, innovation in institutional programs, and cleanliness of physical plant.

Influence Relationships Were Changed

Collective bargaining changed influence relationships in systemwide public university settings. A measurable shift in influence or power was observed from on-campus decision making levels to those off-campus. Three sets of on-campus decision makers (department faculty, faculty governance, and chairpersons/deans) lost influence over decisions as a result of bargaining; one (central administration) gained slightly. The greatest declines in influence occurred at the levels of department faculty and faculty governance. Central administration gained influence over five decision making areas, but lost influence over faculty workload/assignment of duties and, more pointedly, over salary decisions.

All three sets of off-campus decision makers gained influence. The system bargaining agent gained the greatest amount of influence as a result of bargaining. The bargaining agent gained the greatest amount of power in salary increases and substantial amounts of influence over personnel decisions (hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure) and faculty workload/assignment decisions. The bargaining agent gained relatively little in: fund allocation, curriculum policy, program evaluation, or goal setting.

Conversely, state government registered the least gains. State government registered its greatest gain in the area of salary increase decisions and achieved modest gains in the areas of institutional fund allocation and institutional goal setting. Among the seven levels of decision makers considered in this study, the second greatest gain was registered by the system governing board and staff. This level recorded its greatest gains in the areas of goal setting and evaluating programs of instruction. Minor gains were registered in fund allocation and curriculum policy. The system office recorded its only loss in the area of salary increase decisions; this loss in influence was very slight.

The greatest shift in influence was found in the area of salary increases. Here, chairpersons/deans and central administration–followed by faculty governance and department faculty–lost substantial amounts of influence. State government increased their influence over salary decisions. Moderate shifts in authority occurred in personnel decisions and workload/assignment of duties. With the exception of central administration, which gained a slight amount of influence over personnel decisions, each on-campus level lost authority in these two areas and each off-campus area gained. Collective bargaining had relatively little effect in: fund allocation, curriculum policy, program evaluation, or goal setting.

Opinions Were Relatively Homogenous

With the important exception of the state variable, opinions pertaining to changing influence relationships were generally identical. This finding was astonishing and deserves additional comment. Divergence along administrator, chairperson, and faculty lines was expected but largely unobtained. Although these groups differed along expected lines (e.g. bargaining effects on campus issue discussions, paperwork volume, and faculty salary increase levels), they were unanimous in their observation of decision making influence shifts from on- to off-campus locations.

State Was An Important Variable

Another major finding was the importance of state across a variety of questions. State was a significant variable in respect to five of seven predicted outcomes of collective bargaining and in three of ten open questions. State frequently accounted for the response differences in changing authority patterns. Systematically, responses obtained in Minnesota differed from those of the other states. What might be considered adverse effects of bargaining–increased formalization of relationships between faculty and administrators, decreased sense of campus community and decreased importance of faculty governance in decision making–were most pronounced in Minnesota. Favorable effects of bargaining–improved information with increased availability to the academic community and heightened discussion of key campus issues–were least detected in responses from Minnesota. Among the four states, department faculty and faculty governance lost their greatest amounts of influence in Minnesota. Also, the general trend toward decreasing influence among chairpersons/deans was countered. Central administration gained its greatest amount of influence in Minnesota. A similar pattern with Minnesota prevailed at the governing board and staff level. Relatively substantial gains in influence were recorded. New York and Illinois most frequently occupied the middle ground in these analyses, Florida, the opposite end of the continuum.

Length of time under bargaining contract solely did not account for these differences among states. New York–the most experienced in bargaining–and Illinois–the least experienced–often noted similar perceptions. Illinois, with one year of experience in bargaining, provided the greatest proportion of "no change" responses.

The most viable difference among the states was the interpretation placed on the "exclusivity" and "meeting and confer" language of Minnesota's bargaining law. This interpretation eliminated traditional faculty governance in Minnesota. This was not the case in the three other states.

Future Implications

The utility of studies concerned with the impact of collective bargaining in single institution settings, or even in single systems, is called into question. State was a powerful variable differentiating responses across a wide variety of questions. The contributions of other variables were trivial by comparison.

It was initially hypothesized that length of time under bargaining contract might be an important element. Clearly, this variable, by itself, was not critical. Similarly, system size was not important. Conceivably, however, system size interacting with time could influence the manner in which collective bargaining affects institutions.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

Introduction to Interview

During the past several months we have been reviewing the research and literature concerning collective bargaining in Higher Education. Most of this has been concerned with why faculty members seek a bargaining agent, what kind of agent they seek, and predictions of the effects of bargaining on Higher Education. Very little study has been made of results of collective bargaining or of systemwide collective bargaining.

It is the intent of this study to follow up on systemwide collective bargaining in four states: New York, Florida, Minnesota and Illinois—to determine what has happened since the adoption of the first contract. We will be interviewing about 325 faculty and administrators. We are using a structured interview process to ascertain if certain predicted outcomes have in fact occurred.

The first seven statements are predictions from the literature. Please indicate the extent you agree or disagree by using the scale of "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" or use "No Change" as a middle response. All of the statements should be considered in the context of the phrase, "As a result of the collective bargaining process".

Interviewer:

I. Agree or disagree: Strongly or not? Follow up on any response except "No Change" by asking for examples or reasons.

II. In items 8-17 try to get examples if a response indicates the possibility of something out of the ordinary.

III. Take them verbally through item 18 to explain how power shift might occur. Assume 100% power. If there is some increase there should also be some decrease but not necessarily one for one. Depending on how the individual wishes to work on this section, try to get some notes on examples or reasons for any power shifts either while he is completing the form or after completion.

I. As a result of the collective bargaining process:

1. personal relationships between faculty and administrators are increasingly formal, less governed by give and take.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	No Change	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. there has been an increase in the amount and quality of information available to members of the academic community pertaining to key campus issues.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	No Change	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. decisions which affect faculty professional assignments and performance are arrived at more openly.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	No Change	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. there has been a decrease in the feeling of community on campus, community meaning an enterprise governed by consensus and shared values.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	No Change	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. the relative importance of traditional faculty governing bodies (senate, councils and committees) in the decision making process has decreased.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	No Change	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

6. campus-wide issues have been discussed more frequently by greater numbers of the academic community.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	No Change	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

7. junior faculty members have an increased role in decision making.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	No Change	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

II. The next ten statements were designed to determine the impact of collective bargaining in highly specific areas on your campus. The research and literature do not point in any particular direction on these questions. The statements call for increase or decrease type responses.

As a result of the collective bargaining process:

8. teaching contact hours have:

1	2	3	4	5
Significantly Increased	Increased	Remained Constant	Decreased	Significantly Decreased

9. class size has:

1	2	3	4	5
Significantly Increased	Increased	Remained Constant	Decreased	Significantly Decreased

10. expectations that faculty perform original research, create original works, or give artistic performances has:

1	2	3	4	5
Significantly Increased	Increased	Remained Constant	Decreased	Significantly Decreased

11. the volume of your personal paperwork has:

1	2	3	4	5
Significantly Increased	Increased	Remained Constant	Decreased	Significantly Decreased

12. the opportunity for faculty promotion and tenure has:

1	2	3	4	5
Significantly Increased	Increased	Remained Constant	Decreased	Significantly Decreased

13. funds, personnel, and equipment which support teaching and research activities have:

1	2	3	4	5
Significantly Increased	Increased	Remained Constant	Decreased	Significantly Decreased

14. the quality and cleanliness of the physical plant has:

1	2	3	4	5
Substantially Increased	Increased	Stayed the same	Decreased	Substantially Decreased

15. in relation to comparable universities without collective bargaining, salary levels for faculty in the bargaining unit have:

1	2	3	4	5
Substantially Increased	Increased	Stayed the same	Decreased	Substantially Decreased

16. the amount of time spent by faculty in committee meetings has:

1	2	3	4	5
Substantially Increased	Increased	Stayed the same	Decreased	Substantially Decreased

17. innovation and experimentation in your university's instructional programs have:

1	2	3	4	5
Substantially Increased	Increased	Stayed the same	Decreased	Substantially Decreased

III. Power Shift Matrix

We are interested in your perception concerning changes in decision-making authority, or power, as a result of adoption of collective bargaining. Which of the following groups gained or lost influence with respect to seven specific decision making areas? Indicate your judgement in each box according to the following scale:

RESPONSE SCALE:

\+ = Gain in decision making authority ----------ON-CAMPUS---------- --------OFF-CAMPUS--------
0 = No Change
– = Loss in decision making
X = Do not know

	Departmental Faculty	Chairpersons/ deans	Faculty Senate, Councils & Committees	Presidents, V.P.'s	System Governing Board & Staff	System Bargaining Agent	State Gov't-Governors Office/ Legislature
18. Hiring, retention, promotion and tenure of individual faculty.							
19. Establishing institutional salary increase levels.							
20. Faculty workload – Assignment of duties.							

RESPONSE SCALE:

+ = Gain in decision making authority ----------ON-CAMPUS---------- -------OFF-CAMPUS --------
0 = No Change
– = Loss in decision making
X = Do not know

	Departmental Faculty	Chairpersons/ deans	Faculty Senate, Councils & Committees	Presidents, V.P.'s	System Governing Board & Staff	System Bargaining Agent	State Gov't-Governors Office/ Legislature
21. Allocating appropriated funds within the institution.							
22. Development of new courses and curriculum policy.							
23. Evaluating programs of instruction.							
24. Establishing institutional purposes and goals.							

RESPONSE SHEET

1. University: _____

2. I D: _____

3. Category: A. Faculty _____
   B. Administrator _____
   C. Chairperson _____
   D. Systems Office _____

4. U – N

5. Prof. ____ Assoc. ____ Asst. ____ Inst. ____

6. U – N

7. Sex: M ___ F ___

8. Highest Degree: _____

9. Years at Institution: _____

10. Age: Less than 40 ___ 40–50 ___ Over 50 ___

		Comments:
1.	SA ___ A ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____
2.	SA ___ A ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____
3.	SA ___ A ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____
4.	SA ___ A ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____
5.	SA ___ A ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____
6.	SA ___ A ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____
7.	SA ___ A ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____
8.	SI ___ I ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____
9.	SI ___ I ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____
10.	SI ___ I ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____
11.	SI ___ I ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____
12.	SI ___ I ___ NC ___ D ___ SD ___	_____

Comments:

13. SI — I — NC — D — SD— _____

14. SI — I — NC — D — SD— _____

15. SI — I — NC — D — SD— _____

16. SI — I — NC — D — SD— _____

17. SI — I — NC — D — SD— _____

Additional Comments:

_____

18.

_____

19.

_____

20.

_____

21.

_____

22.

_____

23.

_____

24.

_____

APPENDIX B

Methods To Be Used in Selecting Persons To Be Interviewed

Faculty

In selecting faculty members to be interviewed (including teachers, researchers, and librarians and counselors if in the bargaining unit), we would like you to review two lists of names: 1) union members; and 2) non-union members. These lists can be arranged in alphabetical order, social security number order, or by rank. Since we are restricting the interviews to persons employed at the University prior to the first bargaining agreement, a list sorted by persons' years of experience would cause problems. From these two lists, we would like to interview a total of 15 persons. The distribution of persons selected for interview should reflect the mix of union, non-union faculty on your campus.

> By way of example, if you have 100 unit members, 31 of whom are members of the union, we would like to interview 5 of these 31 union members. (31 percent union members x 15 [total unit members to be interviewed] = 4.7 or 5 people.) Similarly, we would hope to interview 10 non-union members (69 percent non-union members x 15).

In order to select the interviewees, please use the following methodology: Go down each list, beginning with the first name, until you reach the numbered name which corresponds to that of the total number of people to be selected from the list. In our example list of 31 union members, go to the fifth name. This is your first selection. (If nine people are to be selected from the list go to the ninth name.) For your second selection, add to the first number (5) the number to be selected (again 5). The tenth person is your second selection. Repeat this pattern (that is the 15th, 20th and 25th names) until you have selected the five persons to be interviewed. If for some reason a particular selection cannot be interviewed (off campus, recessed, unwilling, not an employee of the university before the first bargaining agreement) select as his/her alternate the next person on the list after his/her name. Be sure to apply this method to the two lists, one for union members and one for non-union members.

Chairpersons

A third set of selections is needed for department chairpersons. We would like to interview five chairpersons. In order to select these five individuals, you will need a listing of all chairpersons. Please consult the table below in determining which persons to select. If, for example, you have 19 chairpersons on your campus, use the first column (which covers institutions with from 15 to 20 chairpersons) to determine your selections. You would select the 2nd, 5th, 12th, and 15th individuals on your list.

Number of Chairpersons In Your Institution							
15–20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55
2	3	2	4	7	5	5	10
5	8	9	11	14	14	15	20
8	12	15	18	21	23	25	30
12	17	21	25	38	32	35	40
15	21	26	31	36	41	46	51

As in the case of faculty in the bargaining unit, if someone cannot be interviewed, select the subsequent name on your list.

APPENDIX C

Comparison of Institutions in Terms of Selected Characteristics

	AAUP Category	Academic Program Plan	Full Time Faculty	Type	Environment	Teacher College History
St. Cloud State University	IIA	4 yr. Grad.	437	Residential	Small City	Yes
Mankato State University	IIA	4 yr. Grad.	455	Residential	Small City	Yes
Winona State University	IIA	4 yr. Grad.	164	Residential	Small City	Yes
Florida Atlantic University	I	Upper Div. Grad.	275	Residential	Suburban	No
Florida Tech. University (Univ. of Central Florida)	IIA	4 yr. Grad.	335	Commuter Some Resid.	Urban	No
University of South Florida	I	4 yr. Grad.	760	Commuter 1/3 Resid.	Urban	No
SUNY Albany	I	4 yr. Grad.	649	Residential	Urban	Yes
State Univ. College of Brockport	IIA	4 yr. Grad.	472	Residential	Suburban	Yes
State Univ. College–Buffalo	IIA	4 yr. Grad.	544	Commuter Some Resid.	Urban	Yes

	AAUP Category	Academic Program Plan	Full Time Faculty	Type	Environment	Teacher College History
Western Illinois University	IIA	4 yr. Grad.	672	Residential	Small City	Yes
Governors State University	IIA	Upper Div. Grad.	154	Commuter	Suburban	No
Northeastern Illinois	IIA	4 yr. Grad.	320	Commuter	Urban	Yes

APPENDIX D

Comparison of Systems

System	State-wide	No. of Institutions	Major Admin. Officers	Barg. Authori-zation	Chief Negot. Officer	Barg. Agent	Barg. Unit Composition
Minnesota State University System State University Board	no	7	Chancellor	State law	Chancellor's Office	Inter faculty organiz. MEA	Teaching faculty Librarians Counselors Chairpersons
State University System of Florida Board of Regents	yes	9	Chancellor	State law	Chancellor's Office	United Faculty of Florida AFT	Teaching faculty Librarians Counselors Some Dept. Chairpersons
State University of New York Board of Trustees	yes	29	Chancellor	State law	Governor's Office of Employee Relations	United University Professional AFT	Teaching faculty All other non-teaching professionals except Deans, V.P.s and a few managerial confidential positions
Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities, Illinois	no	5	Executive Director and 5 campus Presidents	No State law Board Gov's Regulations	Executive Director's Office	AFT Faculty Federation	Teaching faculty Librarians Counselors Learning Serv. staff

APPENDIX E

TABLE III

Predictions from the Literature Comparison of Subgroup Means and Significance Levels

⇒	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
Item No.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.
Total Sample	2.202		2.610		2.784		2.491		2.640		2.509		2.857	
Category		.6121		.2009		.4995		.0417		.3997		.0003		.2169
Faculty	2.239		2.557		2.830		2.585		2.665		2.358		2.818	
Admin.	2.172		2.793		2.759		2.756		2.500		2.879		3.000	
Chair.	2.113		2.585		2.660		2.415		2.712		2.604		2.830	
Degree		.3862		.1893		.1657		.0591		.5495		.6598		.2727
Doct.	2.228		2.642		2.749		2.544		2.682		2.540		2.833	
Masters	2.094		2.453		2.813		2.391		2.531		2.391		2.906	
Bach.-Others	2.167		2.833		3.500		1.667		2.333		2.667		3.333	
Age		.0281		.1416		.0115		.0950		.1258		.0129		.0000
Less than 40	2.329		2.553		2.671		2.697		2.461		2.711		2.961	
40-50	2.239		2.605		2.799		2.396		2.714		2.418		2.910	
Over 50	1.973		2.726		2.945		2.452		2.658		2.521		2.740	
Years at Inst.		.8946		.2146		.9804		.2628		.6481		.3824		.4303
1-6	2.269		2.508		2.821		2.612		2.657		2.508		2.970	
7-9	2.159		2.594		2.783		2.580		2.551		2.623		2.826	
10-12	2.192		2.534		2.753		2.411		2.740		2.370		2.781	
13 or more	2.192		2.782		2.782		2.385		2.610		2.539		2.859	
Sex		.3921		.1546		.9977		.8639		.6872		.0360		.7050
Male	2.182		2.644		2.784		2.487		2.630		2.559		2.864	

⇒	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
Item No.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.
Female	2.294		2.451		2.784		2.510		2.686		2.275		2.824	
State		.0000		.0038		.0003		.0000		.0001		.5525		.1016
Fla.	2.377		2.507		2.449		2.783		2.768		2.493		2.841	
Minn.	1.685		2.932		3.123		2.110		2.250		2.616		2.918	
Ill.	2.500		2.513		2.775		2.700		2.650		2.513		2.712	
N.Y.	2.231		2.477		2.769		2.354		2.923		2.400		2.985	
Unit		.8065		.6163		.8539		.3626		.3549		.0070		.6313
Union	2.208		2.521		2.778		2.604		2.720		2.278		2.792	
Non-union	2.239		2.620		2.789		2.465		2.648		2.634		2.887	
Rank		.2814		.3241		.6995		.6745		.2254		.7775		.1862
Prof.	2.140		2.538		2.828		2.516		2.785		2.376		2.699	
Assoc.	2.324		2.662		2.703		2.622		2.671		2.514		2.851	
Assist.	2.289		2.467		2.756		2.533		2.578		2.333		2.933	
Inst.	1.714		3.000		3.000		2.143		2.000		2.286		3.000	

APPENDIX F

TABLE IV

Other Potential Bargaining Outcomes Comparison of Subgroup Means and Significance Levels

⇒	8		9		10		11		12	
Item No.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.
Total Sample	3.052		2.972		2.902		2.383		3.035	
Category		.4677		.6698		.0854		.0000		.6458
Faculty	3.063		2.960		2.840		2.602		3.006	
Admin.	3.086		2.983		2.966		1.845		3.069	
Chair.	2.981		3.000		3.038		2.245		3.094	
Degree		.0006		.0407		.2122		.5000		.3853
Doct.	3.014		2.963		2.930		2.363		3.074	
Masters	3.234		3.000		2.813		2.453		2.906	
Bach.-Other	2.667		2.833		2.667		2.167		3.000	
Age		.0497		.1386		.1206		.3552		.4612
Less than 40	3.053		2.961		2.842		2.421		3.026	
40-50	2.993		2.993		2.940		2.440		3.045	
Over 50	3.137		2.932		2.931		2.247		3.055	
Years at Inst.		.0028		.2519		.2715		.4174		.8504
1-6	3.045		2.970		2.864		2.508		3.030	
7-9	2.913		2.928		2.797		2.362		3.087	
10-12	3.027		3.027		2.959		2.288		3.041	
13 or more	3.205		2.962		2.974		2.385		2.987	
Sex		.0073		.0784		.2122		.0941		.1891
Male	3.017		2.958		2.923		2.348		3.059	

⇒	8		9		10		11		12	
Item No.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.
Female	3.216		3.039		2.804		2.549		2.922	
State		.0000		.5377		.0270		.0004		.2413
Fla.	3.000		2.942		2.838		2.130		2.971	
Minn.	3.314		3.014		2.753		2.260		3.164	
Ill.	2.925		2.962		3.000		2.612		3.037	
N.Y.	2.985		2.969		3.015		2.508		2.954	
Unit		.2933		.9238		.0144		.5492		.6173
Union	3.069		2.965		2.792		2.507		3.014	
Non-union	3.028		2.972		3.057		2.578		3.014	
Rank		.0131		.5289		.8922		.4889		.0696
Prof.	2.957		2.946		2.936		2.442		3.075	
Assoc.	3.054		2.960		2.865		2.568		2.919	
Assist.	3.133		3.000		2.818		2.511		2.956	
Inst.	3.571		3.143		2.857		2.714		3.143	

⇒	13		14		15		16		17	
Item No.										
Total Sample	3.021		3.038		2.815		2.815		3.021	
Category		.2863		.3374		.0027		.5829		.4852
Faculty	3.051		3.023		2.697		2.784		3.000	
Admin.	2.948		3.052		3.017		2.897		3.086	
Chair.	3.000		3.076		2.981		2.830		3.019	
Degree		.9754		.9627		.0313		.0294		.6270
Doct.	3.028		3.037		2.879		2.833		3.042	
Masters	3.000		3.047		2.578		2.688		2.953	
Bach.-Other	3.000		3.000		3.000		3.167		3.000	
Age		.9971		.7277		.8261		.6330		.7573

⇒	13		14		15		16		17	
Item No.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.
Less than 40	3.013		3.040		2.813		2.882		3.066	
40-50	3.022		3.052		2.836		2.813		2.993	
Over 50	3.027		3.014		2.795		2.767		3.027	
Years at Inst.		.5687		.8808		.7900		.9366		.2916
1-6	3.000		3.030		2.773		2.776		3.075	
7-9	3.087		3.044		2.870		2.855		3.044	
10-12	3.000		3.055		2.767		2.822		2.932	
13 or more	3.000		3.026		2.846		2.808		3.039	
Sex		.9816		.5413		.1118		.3282		.0082
Male	3.021		3.042		2.847		2.835		3.055	
Female	3.020		3.020		2.667		2.726		2.863	
State		.5095		.0114		.0013		.0781		.5746
Fla.	3.000		3.029		2.986		2.812		3.015	
Minn.	2.986		3.014		2.534		2.945		3.055	
Ill.	3.012		3.000		2.873		2.850		3.050	
N.Y.	3.092		3.123		2.877		2.631		2.954	
Unit		.2340		.6248		.0000		.2633		.0155
Union	3.014		3.028		2.549		2.736		2.944	
Non-union	3.113		3.056		3.186		2.887		3.141	
Rank		.2573		.8250		.3138		.4971		.0599
Prof.	3.075		3.054		2.828		2.828		3.032	
Assoc.	2.987		3.014		2.685		2.838		2.973	
Assist.	2.978		3.044		2.733		2.622		2.933	
Inst.	3.200		3.000		2.429		2.857		2.857	

APPENDIX G

TABLE V

Aggregate Power Shift for Decision Making Levels Comparison of Subgroup Means and Significance Levels

	Dept.		Chair/Deans		Fac. Gov.		Pres./V.P.		Board		Syst/Agent		Govt.	
	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.
Total Sample	13.327		13.758		13.326		14.095		14.598		16.027		14.366	
Category		.6614		.5248		.3478		.8454		.7348		.5100		.7074
Faculty	13.383		13.619		13.459		14.045		14.508		16.031		14.302	
Admin.	13.056		14.074		12.923		14.037		14.816		15.837		14.426	
Chair.	13.451		13.804		13.391		14.311		14.600		16.256		14.487	
Degree		.6794		.0278		.1225		.6015		.5045		.3045		.1763
Doct.	13.309		13.711		13.309		13.983		14.711		15.965		14.443	
Masters	13.473		13.640		13.563		14.404		14.267		16.170		14.073	
Bach.-Others	11.667		17.500		10.333		15.667		13.000		17.333		13.500	
Age		.0039		.5438		.1077		.1006		.5091		.1069		.8950
Less than 40	13.295		13.696		13.127		13.732		14.547		16.208		14.400	
40-50	13.155		13.883		13.412		14.268		14.762		16.185		14.316	
Over 50	13.409		13.508		13.492		14.279		14.415		15.546		14.451	
Years at Inst.		.5200		.3263		.7726		.1286		.0729		.0134		.0995
1-6	13.018		13.411		13.058		13.685		13.980		16.245		14.039	
7-9	13.271		13.782		13.404		14.113		14.434		16.000		14.412	
10-12	13.692		13.565		13.305		13.719		14.800		16.429		14.702	
13 or more	13.280		14.183		13.486		14.721		15.082		15.466		14.340	
Sex		.3368		.1785		.9734		.9785		.3510		.1746		.8091
Male	13.259		13.665		13.328		14.097		14.658		15.962		14.375	

	Dept.		Chair/Deans		Fac. Gov.		Pres./V.P.		Board		Syst/Agent		Govt.	
	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.	Mean	Sig.
Female	13.667		14.263		13.314		14.083		14.233		16.394		14.308	
State		.0014		.0000		.0025		.0000		.0000		.5841		.0311
Fla.	13.803		13.000		13.679		13.018		13.589		15.790		14.741	
Minn.	12.258		15.271		12.509		15.983		16.216		16.083		14.261	
Ill.	13.536		13.304		13.143		13.540		14.536		16.217		14.000	
N.Y.	13.694		13.517		14.000		13.821		14.157		16.019		14.440	
Unit		.2146		.5856		.4778		.8935		.4035		.4543		.1216
Union	13.653		13.675		13.500		14.073		14.667		16.193		14.179	
Non-union	13.000		13.517		13.500		14.109		14.180		15.816		14.674	
Rank		.0321		.0356		.4284		.2828		.1066		.5298		.5472
Prof.	13.318		13.988		13.525		14.228		14.986		16.000		14.471	
Assoc.	13.492		13.508		13.614		13.796		14.460		15.946		14.426	
Asst.	14.079		13.829		13.063		13.788		13.688		16.382		14.138	
Inst.	11.750		13.250		14.500		15.500		14.333		15.333		14.000	

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angell, George W. *Management Perogatives and Faculty Rights.* Special Report No. 29. Washington, DC: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1977. ED 136 714.

Baldridge, J. Victor. *Power and Conflict in the University.* New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1971.

Bartos, Michael W. "Anatomy of a Settlement: Faculty Salary Negotiations at William Rainey Harper College in 1976." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Nova University, 1977. ED 144 636.

Begin, James P. "Faculty Governance and Collective Bargaining: An Early Appraisal." *Journal of Higher Education* 45 (1974): 582-593.

_____; Settle, Theodore C.; and Berke-Weiss, Laurie. *Community College Collective Bargaining in New Jersey: Study Report and Recommendations.* New Brunswick, NJ: Institute of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University, 1977. ED 151 046.

Beninate, Nicholas A. "A Study to Determine the Impact of the State of Florida's New Collective Bargaining Guidelines on the Personnel Policies and Procedures of Eight Community Colleges in Florida." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Nova University, 1975. ED 140 899.

Bernhardt, Regis G. "Why Collective Bargaining in Higher Education." *Research in Higher Education* 7 (1977): 79-95.

Boyer, William W. "The Role of Department Chairman in Collective Bargaining: The University of Delaware Experience." *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 25 (1974): 49.

Bronsard, Donald Russell. "A Development, Comparison, and Contrast of Selected Faculty-Administration Consensuses Regarding Collective Bargaining Contracts in Connecticut's Four Subsystems of Public Higher Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Storrs, Connecticut: University of Connecticut, 1975. ED 125 432.

Bullis, Bruce. "Trust and the Inclination of Faculty Toward Collective Bargaining at Northeastern Illinois University." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University, 1976.

Bylsma, Donald Jr., and Blackburn, Robert. "Some Consequences of Collective Negotiations in Higher Education." *Phi Delta Kappa* 54 (1972): 130.

Byrnes, Joseph F. "Resolution of the Department Chairman Issue Through Collective Bargaining." *The Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 28 (1977): 34-38.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. *Faculty Bargaining in Public Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Carr, Robert K., and Van Eyck, Daniel. *Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1973. ED 093 200.

Chandler, Margaret; et al. *Is Institutional Prestige the Key Variable in Faculty Collective Bargaining?* Special Report No. 31. Washington, DC: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1977. ED 142 158.

Cohen, M.D., and March, J.G. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Collective Bargaining in Postsecondary Educational Institutions. Report No. 45. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1974.

Crossland, Fred E. "Faculty Collective Bargaining: Impact on Planning." *Intellect* 106 (1977): 67-70.

Duryea, E.D., and Fisk, Robert S. *Faculty Unions and Collective Bargaining.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

_____; and Needy, John C. *Collective Bargaining: Impact on Governance.* Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards, 1977. ED 140 772.

Ehrle, Ellwood B., and Earley, Jane F. "The Effect of Collective Bargaining on Department Chairpersons and Deans." *Educational Record* 57 (1977) 149-154.

Falcone, Michael A. *Collective Bargaining: Its Effects on Campus Governance.* Special Report No. 16. Washington, DC: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1975. ED 104 229.

Garbarino Joseph W. *Faculty Bargaining: Change and Conflict.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Garlock, Jerry C. *Collective Bargaining: Attitudes of College Presidents Compared With Presidents of Academic Senates.* Torrance, CA: El Camino College, 1975. ED 116 730.

Gemmel, James. "Protecting Campus Autonomy and Responsibility Within Statewide Bargaining." In *Handbook of Faculty Bargaining* edited by George W. Angell, Edward P. Kelley, Jr., and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 1977.

Goeres, Ernest R. "Sabbatical, Personal, Maternity and Sick Leave Policies." *Collective Bargaining Perspectives* 2 (1977) ED 145 776.

Goodwin, Harold I., ed. "Faculty Union Contracts: The New Organizational Rules." *Collective Bargaining Perspectives* 2 (1977) ED 143 263.

_____, "The Impact of Unions and Collective Bargaining on American Higher Education." In *Reshaping American Higher Education* 1st ed. edited by Louis C. Vaccaro. Irving, Texas: AMI Press, University of Dallas, 1975.

Hansen, Barbara J., and Petrizzo, D. Richard. "Faculty and Administrative Attitudes Toward and Expectations Concerning Recognized Collective Bargaining at College of Du Page As Compared With Emperical Findings." Unpublished Ed.D. Practicum. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Nova University, 1976. ED 134 254.

Hedgepath, Royster C. "An Exploratory Analysis of the Consequences of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education: The Role of the Faculty." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL, 1974. ED 090 865.

Hornbeck, David W. "Improving Educational Services Through Statewide Bargaining." *In Handbook of Faculty Bargaining* edited by George W. Angell, Edward P. Kelley, Jr. and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Johnson, Mark D.; and Mortimer, Kenneth P. *Faculty Bargaining and the Politics of Retrenchment in the Pennsylvania State Colleges, 1971-1976.* University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1977. ED 148 201.

Julius, Daniel J. "Collective Bargaining in Higher Education: The First Decade." *Research Currents.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education. Nov. 1977. ED 145 762.

Kelley, Edward P. Jr.; and Rodriquez, Robert L. "Observations on Collective Bargaining: Implications for Academic Management." *Liberal Education.* 63 (1977) 102-117.

Kemerer, Frank R., and Baldridge, J. Victor. "The Impact of Faculty Collective Bargaining on Campus Administrators." Mimeographed. February, 1976 ED 138 126.

_____, and Baldridge, J. Victor. *Unions on Campus.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Kersteins, Gene, "Attitudes of Middle Management Administrators Concerning Collective Bargaining in a Community College." Unpublished Ed.D. Practicum. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Nova University, 1977. ED 136 883.

Ladd, Everett Carll, and Lipset, Semour Martin. "Faculty Support for Unionization Leveling Off at About 75 Per Cent." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 22 (February 13, 1978).

_____, and Lipset Semour Martin. *Professors, Unions and Higher Education.* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1973.

_____, and Lipset Semour Martin. "The Big Differences Among Faculty Unions." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 22 (March, 1978).

Lee, Barbara A. *Collective Bargaining in Four Year Colleges* Report No. 5, Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1978.

Leslie, Larry L., and Hu, Teh-wei. *The Financial Implications of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education.* University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1977.

Levenstein, Aaron Ed., and Lang, Theordore H. Director. *Collective Bargaining and the Future of Higher Education.* Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Conference. New York: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, Baruch College-CUNY, 1977. ED 152 138.

Lozier, G. Gregory; and Johnson, Mark D., "The Bargaining Battle at Penn State." *Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.* July/August, 1978.

MaCoy, Ramelle, and Morand, Martin J. "Establishing Constructive Relationships Between Administrators and Faculty Unions." In *Handbook of Faculty Bargaining,* edited by George W. Angell, Edward P. Kelley and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Masi, Anthony. "Unionism and Collective Bargaining in the Public Institutions of Higher Education in Rhode Island." Unpublished Field Project. Rhode Island College, 1977. ED 144-463.

Millet, John. *The Academic Community.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Mortimer, Kenneth P., ed. *Faculty Bargaining, State Government and Campus Autonomy: The Experience in Eight States.* Report No. 87. Denver: Educational Commission of the States, 1976. ED 124 224.

_____, and Richardson, Richard C. Jr., *Government in Institutions with Faculty Unions. Six Case Studies.* University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1977. ED 140 764.

Nicholson, Michael W. "Effects of Faculty Bargaining." *College and University Personnel Association Journal* 28 (1977) 38-47.

Nighswander, James K. *The Perceived Effects of Teacher Collective Bargaining on Schools and Colleges – A Survey of North Central Association Administrators.* Final Report. Chicago, IL: North Central Association, 1977. ED 136 416.

Pettit, Lawrence K. "Bargaining Educational Diversity in a Centralized State System." In *Handbook of Faculty Bargaining*. edited by George W. Angell, Edward P. Kelley and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Powell, Walter H. "Making the Contract a Beneficial Instrument of University Governance." In *Handbook of Faculty Bargaining*. edited by George W. Angell, Edward P. Kelley and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Rabinoff, Marc A. *The Collective Bargaining Movement in Higher Education: A Chronological Analysis and Review of the Factors, Consequences, and Trends, 1961-1977*. Denver, CO: Metropolitan State College, 1977. ED 153 567.

Report on the Annual Survey of Faculty Compensation, 1977-78." *AAUP Bulletin* (September, 1978).

Richardson, Richard C., and Mortimer, Kenneth P. "Collective Bargaining and the Redefinition of Administrative Roles." *Educational Record* 58 (1978) 332-344.

Riechmann, Sheryl, and others. *Collective Bargaining: The Faculty Viewpoint and What Collective Bargaining Means to University Administrators*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education, 1976. ED 140 707.

Semas, Philip W. "Collective Bargaining and Faculty Governance." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 14 (July 5, 1977).

Shantz, David W. "Collective Bargaining and the Growing Crisis in Higher Education: "A Faculty Perspective." In *Collective Bargaining in Higher Education*. edited by Thomas M. Mannix. Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Conference, New York: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, Baruch College-CUNY, 1976. ED 136 659.

Sommers, Alexis N. "Collective Bargaining: Issues and Complexities of the Campus Environment." *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 29 (1978) 16-24.

Stoup, Herbert H. *Bureaucracy in Higher Education*. New York: Free Press, 1966.

"Two Views on Collective Bargaining." Presentation to the Southern Regional Education Board Legislative Work Conference by John Silber and Robert Nielsen. Atlanta, GA., 1977. ED 149 675.

Walker, J. Malcom, and Lawler, John J. "Collective Bargaining in Higher Education: Administrative Perspectives." Presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, March, 1978. ED 152 132.

_____, and Lawler John J. *Interaction of Efficacy, Commitment and Expectations in Faculty Attitude Formation*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of Business and Economics Research, 1978. ED 153 513.